



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Position of the Navy Question in Congress.

The vote of both branches of Congress in favor of adding two new Dreadnoughts to the navy seems to leave the question in practically the same position as last year. The opponents of further naval expansion in both Houses presented their case in a very able way, and but for the exigencies of politics they would certainly have won.

In the Senate, under the lead of Senators Hale, Burton and Bacon, the opposition seems to have developed unusual strength, the vote being twenty-six against the building of two further battleships to thirty-six in favor. A number of Senators are reported to have expressed in private their strong aversion to further increase of the navy and their determination never again to vote for two ships.

The state of feeling in the House was very much the same. A considerable number of Republicans voted for the two ships only because of their unwillingness to oppose the Administration's program. The growing opposition to further increase showed itself clearly in the House Committee on Naval Affairs, four members of which made a minority report against the authorizing of the two Dreadnoughts recommended by the majority. This is the first time, we believe, that a minority report of this kind has ever come from this Committee.

Throughout the country there is not the least doubt that dissatisfaction with the present naval program is steadily deepening and widening. Evidences of this are found in the remonstrance of the seven hundred and fifty-two Massachusetts clergymen, in the very large number of letters of protest from all over the country written to Congressmen, and in the public utterances of prominent men and prominent organizations in all parts of the land.

The victory for good sense and economy in this direction is not yet won, but it is not far away.

The demand for an agreement among the powers for the effective arrest of the present competitive arming is growing louder and stronger with every passing year. This demand was voiced in a characteristic way by ex-President Roosevelt in his Nobel Prize address. It was voiced recently by Baron d'Estournelles de Constant in another great speech in the French Senate. It has been voiced by many other prominent men during the past year.

Relief from the immense burdens of armaments, under which the nations are groaning and growing more restless and impatient daily, is not yet at hand, but it is on the way, and it is one of the chief duties of all the friends of peace to continue to do all in their power to hasten its coming. Congresses and parliaments have closed for the summer, but they will meet again next winter. It is our duty to prepare for them, when they meet again, such an over-

whelming volume of opposition to the present ruinous régime of armed suspicion and distrust as will compel them in their next sessions to give the people the relief which is their due.

A King Edward Peace Memorial.

The annual meeting of the Peace Society in London on the 24th of May, including a notable breakfast, the business meeting in the afternoon and a great public meeting in the Guild Hall in the evening, was a memorable occasion. It was made so not only because of the unprecedented attendance of more than a thousand people in the evening and the addresses of Lord Avebury, the Bishop of Hereford, Andrew Carnegie, Sir William Mather, J. Allen Baker, M. P., Sir Thomas Barclay, Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon, J. Ramsay Macdonald, M. P., Lord Shaw and Rev. J. Scott Lidget, but also by the manner in which the peace work of the late King Edward impressed itself upon the meetings and speakers.

The chief interest of the day seemed to centre in the proposal made at the breakfast, that, in view of the eminent services to the peace cause rendered by the late King, a movement should be started for the establishment of a King Edward International League of Peace, or a worthy memorial to him in some other form. Sir William Mather, who made the suggestion of the League, said that he hoped to see a quarter of a million pounds subscribed in England for this purpose. J. Allen Baker, M. P., who has done so much for good relations between Great Britain and Germany, expressed the belief that the German Emperor would be very ready to join in a movement for such a league.

The further suggestion of Sir William Mather that a bust of the late King be placed in the Peace Palace at The Hague was at once approved and steps taken to carry out the proposal.

The matter of the memorial to the King is to be carefully studied by the executive committee of the Peace Society, and the exact form of it will be decided on only after careful deliberation and consultation with the friends of peace in general throughout Great Britain.

The Bishop of Hereford declared on opening the meeting in the Guild Hall that the most hopeful of all the signs of coming permanent peace is the growth of educated democracy and the fact, as he believes, that the peoples of all the various nations are of one mind in their desire for mutual goodwill and peace. This is certainly a most hopeful omen. But an almost equally hopeful sign, indeed in some respects a more striking sign, is the phenomenon which the death of King Edward has called out. This phenomenon in its last analysis has of course been the expression of the growing power of

universal democracy and the consequent feeling of solidarity and mutual interest on the part of peoples everywhere. With this attitude of the peoples of the world King Edward had become well acquainted. He was deeply impressed by it and in genuine sympathy with it.

It is indeed a thing greatly to rejoice over when a monarch, the sovereign of the greatest empire on the face of the globe, becomes the centre of crystallization of the movement for the fraternity, the federation, the fellowship and the peace of the world. The growth and power of the peace movement is thus revealed as it could scarcely be in any other way. Sir William Mather, therefore, struck the very heart of the whole situation when he proposed a movement for a Peace League of the Nations in the name of King Edward.

If such a movement can be inaugurated and carried out on genuinely pacific lines, keeping out of sight the idea of force and compulsion which have been prominently put forward by some, it will be nothing more than the carrying forward and widening of the work in which King Edward was so successful as a peacemaker. A peace league of the nations, or of a few of the great powers, founded on or backed by armies and navies would, as we have often said, even if it could be organized, be foredoomed to failure, and would turn out to be not a league of peace at all, but something of a very different nature, as was the case with the Holy Alliance a hundred years ago. From no point of view is reliance upon such agencies necessary. The great powers — Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Austria-Hungary, Italy, the United States and Japan — are the fighting, the armed and aggressive powers. If these can be brought into a solemn agreement to keep the peace with each other, there will be no imaginable reason for a pledge on their part to compel other nations to abstain from war. The trouble is with these very powers, and not with the secondary nations, either new or old. The plea that the League of Peace should include an agreement to force the other nations to keep the peace has not a single shred of argument in its favor.

We hope, then, that our friends in England, if they decide to try to put the memorial in the form of a Peace League of the Nations, instead of a great peace library or a munificent fund for peace propaganda or a peace prize fund, after the manner of the Nobel foundation — for all these have been suggested — we hope, we say, that they will place the effort on the only basis which offers any assurance of permanent success, as the history of the Hague Conferences, and indeed of the entire peace movement, proves. The task will be a difficult one in any event. But we are not without sincere hope that, in the present advancement and power of the cause, a Peace League of the Nations may be brought about that

will banish the savagery and folly of war from the world, as Mr. Carnegie in his speech at the Guild Hall meeting, with so much insight, declared will be the case.

Indeed, such a League of Peace is inevitable in a few years, through the work of the Hague Conferences, if no shorter way can be found. That is exactly what is working itself out through these great world gatherings and the many and varied forces which are behind them, and one cannot help wondering whether, after all, in this case, as in so many other important matters, the longer way round may not be the nearer way home.

Editorial Notes.

The tribunal at The Hague to which the Newfoundland fisheries dispute was referred opened its sessions on June 1. The members of the tribunal are Dr. Lammasch, Professor of International Law at Vienna University, president; Dr. Drago of Argentina; Dr. Savornin Lohman of The Netherlands; Judge George Gray of the United States, and Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, Chief Justice of Canada. The British agent is Hon. A. B. Aylesworth, and the United States agent, Charles P. Anderson of the New York Bar. The American Counsel before the Court are Senator Elihu Root, George Turner of Washington, Samuel J. Elder of Boston, Charles B. Warner of Detroit, Dr. James Brown Scott, Solicitor of the State Department, and Robert Lansing of Watertown, N. Y. It would be hard to find abler men of the law in this country. The British Counsel, at the head of whom is the Attorney-General, Sir William Robeson, are likewise among the ablest lawyers and jurists of England. The case therefore is sure to be investigated with the most conscientious thoroughness, and the justice of the controversy discovered and set forth. It is too early yet to give any indication of the character of the decision. On opening the tribunal Dr. Lammasch spoke in the highest terms of the example set by the United States and Great Britain in referring this century-old dispute to the Hague Court. It showed their complete confidence in the pacific, judicial method of settling international conflicts. He thought that these two powers had done perhaps more than any other nations for the cause of international justice and peace, especially during the reign of the great monarch who had just passed away.

The Fisheries Arbitration.

The preparations for the eighteenth International Peace Congress at Stockholm the first week in August are now practically complete. From present indications there will be a strong delegation from this country in the Congress. The American Peace Society will be represented by its Secretary, Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood; by Dr. Philip S.

Delegates to Stockholm.